REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the final Office Action dated January 18, 2006. Claims 1, 6 to 9, 11, 16 to 19, 23, 24, 27, 28, 31 and 32 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 9, 11, 19, 23, 24, 31 and 32, all of which are independent, have been amended. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 6 to 9, 11, 16 to 19, 23, 24, 27, 28, 31 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Applicants Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,113,519 (Johnson), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,727,155 (Dawson). Reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested.

The present invention generally concerns accessing an address book within a communication device, in which data of the address book is accessed in response to operations of a local user interface, and data of the address book is also accessed in response to requests from remote devices on a network. A decision is made whether to permit or deny address book data changing requests for the local and remote accesses. A judgment is made whether or not a first guide display is displayed on a local user interface (or a display regarding the address book is displayed on an operating screen of the communication device). Address book changes are denied for the remote access when it is judged that the first guide display is displayed on the local user interface (or the display regarding the address book is being displayed on the operating screen), even if change of the address book is completed. Address book changes are permitted for the remote access when it is judged that the first guide display is not displayed on the local user interface (or the display regarding the address book is not being displayed on the operating screen).

- 12 -

Thus, among its many features, the present invention provides for (i) judging whether or not a first guide display is displayed on a local user interface (or a display regarding an address book is displayed on an operating screen of a communication device), and (ii) permitting or denying address book changes for a remote access based on the judgment.

Referring specifically to the claims, independent Claim 1 as amended is directed to a communication device having an address book storing data of communication destinations. The device includes first access means for accessing data of the address book in response to operations of a local user interface, and second access means for accessing data of the address book in response to requests from remote devices on a network. The device also includes control means for deciding to permit or deny address book data changing requests from the first access means, and from the second access means, and first display control means for displaying a first guide display on the local user interface, wherein the first guide display is operable by a local user to access data of the address book from the first access means. In addition, the device includes judgment means for judging whether or not the first guide display is displayed on the local user interface. The control means denies address book changes from the second access means when it is judged by the judgement means that the first guide display is displayed on the local user interface, even if change of the address book is completed by the first access means, and permits address book changes from the second access means when it is judged by the judgement means that the first guide display is not displayed on the local user interface.

Independent Claims 11 and 23 as amended are respectively directed to a method and a computer program which are seen to generally correspond with Claim 1.

- 13 -

Independent Claim 9 as amended is directed to a communication device having an address book storing data of communication destinations. The device includes a local operating unit for accessing data of the address book for a local user via a local user interface, and a remote operating unit for accessing data of the address book for remote users on a network. The device also includes a control unit for deciding to permit or deny address book data changing requests from the local operating unit, and from the remote operating unit, and a first display control unit for displaying a first guide display on the local user interface, wherein the first guide display is operable by the local user to access data of the address book from the local operating unit. In addition, the device includes a judgment unit for judging whether or not the first guide display is displayed on the local user interface. The control unit denies address book changes from the remote operating unit when it is judged by the judgment unit that the first guide is displayed on the local user interface, even if change of the address book is completed by the local operating unit, and permits address book changes from the remote operating unit when it is judged by the judgment unit that the first guide display is not displayed on the local user interface.

Independent Claims 19 and 24 as amended are respectively directed to a method and a computer program which are seen to generally correspond with Claim 9.

Independent Claim 31 as amended is directed to a communication device having an address book storing data of communication destinations. The device includes first access means for accessing data of the address book in response to operations of a local user interface, and second access means for accessing data of the address book in response to requests from remote devices on a network. The device also includes judgment means for judging whether or not a display regarding the address book is displayed on an

- 14 -

operating screen of the communication device. In addition, the device includes control

means for controlling to permit or prevent changing of the address book, wherein the

control means prevents changing of the address book by the second access means when it

is judged by the judgment means that the display regarding the address book is being

displayed on the operating screen of the communication device, even if change of the

address book is completed by the first access means, and permits changing of the address

book by the second access means when it is judged by the judgment means that the display

regarding the address book is not being displayed on the operating screen of the

communication device.

Independent Claim 32 as amended is directed to a method which is seen to

generally correspond with Claim 31.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of the

invention of the subject application. In particular, AAPA, Johnson and Dawson are not

seen to disclose or suggest at least the features of (i) judging whether or not a first guide

display is displayed on a local user interface (or a display regarding an address book is

displayed on an operating screen of a communication device), and (ii) permitting or

denying address book changes for a remote access based on the judgment.

The Office Action acknowledged that the AAPA does not disclose the

permission or denial of data changing requests. However, the Office Action cited to

Johnson for this alleged disclosure.

As understood by Applicant, Johnson discloses a system in which clients

that perform read or write system calls for a file obtain permission to do so from the server

- 15 -

of the file by requesting one of the file's multiple read tokens or the file's one write token. Only one client can have the write token at a time. See Johnson, column 6, lines 11 to 35.

However, nothing Johnson is seen to disclose or suggest that a judgment is made as to whether or not a first guide display is displayed on a local user interface (or a display regarding an address book is displayed on an operating screen of a communication device). Moreover, Johnson is not seen to disclose or suggest permitting or denying address book changes for a remote access based on such a judgment.

Dawson is not seen to compensate for the deficiencies of AAPA and Johnson. As understood by Applicants, Dawson discloses that an icon can be included in the title bar of each application on a host system which is being shared with a remote system. This icon indicates to the user of the host system that the application is being shared, and also indicates whether it is being shared in "locked" or "unlocked" access. Locked access means that the current display of the shared application is being sent to the remote system, but attempted modifications to this application made by the remote system will not affect the application running on the host system. Unlocked access means that the current display of the shared application is being sent to the remote system, and changes made to this application by the remote system are being received and acted upon by the host system. See Dawson, column 6, line 62 to column 7, line 65; and Figure 2.

As such, access to an application in Dawson by a remote system is not seen to correspond with whether a first guide display is displayed on a local user interface (or a display regarding an address book is displayed on an operating screen of a communication device). Rather, when an icon in Dawson is shown on the host system, either "locked" or "unlocked" access to the application is possible.

- 16 -

Accordingly, Dawson is not seen to disclose or suggest judging whether or not a first guide display is displayed on a local user interface (or a display regarding an address book is displayed on an operating screen of a communication device), much less permitting or denying address book changes for a remote access based on such a judgment.

As such, even if AAPA, Johnson and Dawson are combined in the manner proposed in the Office Action (assuming for argument's sake that such combination would be permissible), the result would not teach at least the features of (i) judging whether or not a first guide display is displayed on a local user interface (or a display regarding an address book is displayed on an operating screen of a communication device), and (ii) permitting or denying address book changes for a remote access based on the judgment.

Accordingly, based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, independent Claims 1, 9, 11, 19, 23, 24, 31 and 32 as amended are believed to be allowable over the applied references.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

- 17 -

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

John D. Magluyan
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 56,867

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 110672v1

- 18 -